



## THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI.

Wednesday, April 5, 1848.

## A Dissertation on Slavery.

With a proposal for the gradual abolition of it, in the State of Virginia, by St. George Tucker, Professor of Law in the University of William and Mary, and one of the Judges in the General Court in Virginia—Printed in 1796.

Such a dissertation could not be published in Virginia, at the present day, without subjecting its author to the Penitentiary. The simple motto, with which St. George Tucker adorned his title-page, would be enough in these days to reduce the most distinguished son of Virginia, to the disagreeable necessity of living on bread and water amidst a gang of condemned criminals.

It is a quotation from Montesquieu:—"Slavery not only violates the Laws of Nature, and of civil society; it also wounds the best forms of Government: in a Democracy, where all men are equal, slavery is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution." But, when this Dissertation was written, Virginia had not yet learned to bend the neck—her spirit was free, her utterance unshackled—the slaveholder had not yet ventured to gag her free sons, that he might with more security bind chains upon his black slaves. Times are changed. The white people of Virginia now number 740,000; but not a man of them can lawfully write or speak against slavery, or even take from the Post Office such a dissertation as St. George Tucker wrote in 1796, because 50,000 slaveholders have forbidden them. The entire white population has lost its liberties under the same system which has ground the black race to the dust.

Meanwhile let us refresh ourselves with glimpses at the ancient spirit of Virginia.

The style in which the distinguished professor in the University of William and Mary, exposes the inconsistency of his state, in perpetuating slavery, while professing devotion to the largest liberty, reminds one of that "modern abolitionism" which is now so offensive to the Old Dominion.

"Among the blessings which the Almighty hath showered down on these states, there is a large portion of the bitter draught, that ever flowed from the cup of affliction. Whilst America hath been the land of promise to Europeans, and their descendants, it hath been the vale of death to millions of the wretched sons of Africa. The general light of liberty, which hath here shone with unrivalled lustre on the former, hath yielded no comfort to the latter, but to them hath proved a pillar of darkness, whilst it hath conducted the former to the most enviable state of human existence. Whilst we were offering up vows at the shrine of Liberty, and sacrificing hecatombs upon her altars; whilst we swore irreconcilable hostility to her enemies, and hurled defiance in their faces; whilst we adjured the God of Battles to witness our resolution to live free, or die, and imprecated curses on their heads who refused to unite with us in establishing the empire of freedom, we were imposing upon our fellow-men, who differ in complexion from us, a slavery, ten thousand times more cruel than the utmost extremity of those grievances and oppressions of which we complained. Such are the inconsistencies of human nature; such the blindness of those who pluck not the beam out of their own eyes, whilst they can spy a mote in the eyes of their brother; such that partial system of morality which confines rights and injuries to particular complexions; such the effect of that self-love which justifies or condemns, not according to principle, but to the agent. Had we turned our eyes inwardly when we supplicated the Father of Mercies to aid the injured and oppressed; when we invoked the Author of Righteousness to attest the motives, and the justice of our cause; and implored the God of Battles to aid our exertions in his defence, should we not have most self-convinced that the contrite publican? Should we have left our gift upon the altar, that we might be first reconciled to our brethren whom we held in bondage? Should we not have loosed their chains and broken their fetters? Or if the difficulties and danger of such an experiment prohibited the attempt during the convulsions of a revolution, is it not our duty to embrace the first moment of constitutional health and vigor to effectuate so desirable an object, and to remove from us a stigma, with which our enemies will never fail to upbraid us, nor our conscience to reproach us?"

Mr. Tucker then notices the introduction of slavery into this country. "The first introduction of it into Virginia was by the arrival of a Dutch ship from the coast of Africa, having twenty negroes aboard, who were sold there in the year, 1620. In the year 1638 we find them in Massachusetts. They were introduced into Connecticut soon after the settlement of that colony, that is to say, about the same period."

As to the rightfulness of slavery, the professor adopted the opinions and reasonings of the Author of the Commentaries on the Laws of England. These are snatched up in the following words.

"If neither captivity nor the sale of one's self can by the law of nature and reason reduce the parent to slavery, much less can they reduce the offspring"—upon which Mr. Tucker remarks—"Thus by the most clear, manly, and convincing reasoning does this excellent author refute every claim upon which the practice of slavery is founded, or by which it has been supposed to be justified, at least in modern times."

Such were the sentiments of one of the leading men of Virginia, in 1796. Indeed, he seems anxious to sweep away all ground for apology. For, says he, "were we even to admit, that a captive taken in a just war, might by his conqueror be reduced to a state of slavery, this could not justify the claim of Europeans to reduce the natives of Africa to that state: it is a melancholy though well known fact, that in order to furnish supplies of these unhappy people for the purposes of the slave trade, the Europeans have constantly, by the most insidious (I had almost said infernal) arts, fomented a kind of perpetual warfare among the ignorant and miserable people of Africa; and instances have not been wanting where, by the most shameful breach of faith, they have trepanned and made slaves of the sellers as well as the sold. That such horrid practices have been sanctioned by a civilized nation; that a nation at war, in the cause of liberty, and enjoying its blessings in the fullest extent, can continue to vindicate a right established upon such a foundation; that a people who have declared 'that all men by nature are equally free and independent,' and have made this declaration the first article in the foundation of their government, should in defiance of so sacred a truth, recognized by themselves in so solemn a manner, and on so important an occasion, tolerate a practice incompatible therewith, is such an evidence of the weakness and inconsistency of human nature, as every man who hath a spark of patriotic fire in his bosom must wish

to see removed from his own country. If ever there was a cause, if ever an occasion, in which all hearts should be united, every nerve strained, and every power exerted, surely the restoration of human nature to its inalienable rights is such."

By the way, the note which Mr. Tucker appends to this part of his book in relation to the rise of the slave trade, reminds us of an anecdote we lately saw in one of our exchanges. About the year 1760 a meeting of merchants was held at Belfast Ireland, to form a company for trading in slaves. After certain preliminaries had been disposed of, and documents prepared for signatures, a gentleman who had till then been silent, arose & with terrible emphasis, exclaimed—"May the hand that first signs papers for this infernal traffic be blasted by the God of Justice—the God of the black as well as the white man!" The meeting broke up without signatures, and never assembled again.

We would give a good price, even in these hard times, to know the name of that noble Irishman.

We have crowded our columns lately with so many long articles, that we must postpone further notice of this very interesting Dissertation.

## The West Indies—Want of Labor—Emigration from Africa.

Our readers are aware, that among the great and wholesome changes, consequent upon the abolition of slavery in the British West Indies, the demand for labor there has increased to a surprising degree. It seems that the government has at last determined to satisfy this want, by importing free laborers from Sierra Leone, restricting the operation for the present to this place, except in the case of recaptured Africans. The Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society are deeply apprehensive that the movement may stimulate the internal slave traffic in Africa, and embolden Spain, Brazil and other slave-holding countries, to allow a new species of slave-trade.

"Free African labor," they are satisfied, "except to a limited extent at Sierra Leone and Gambia, cannot be gotten, notwithstanding the confident assertions to the contrary."

"The Kroos and Fishmen, who will be invited to go to the West Indies when Sierra Leone is exhausted, are not free in such a sense as to constitute them voluntary agents in their engagements with the Government or the planters. Their chiefs must be consulted, and presents given, before they will consent to their departure from their homes; and then their wives and children will be retained in pawn until their return, when it is more than probable the chiefs will come in for the lion's share of their earnings. This is the case now. Moreover, we are satisfied, that, when the chiefs have associated, compulsion will be used to make the Kroos, who prefer the coast of Africa to the West Indies, willing to go whithersoever the agent may point."

Lord Stanley may pledge his responsibility that this shall not be the case. We leg to tell the noble Lord that we cannot accept the pledge in the present case. The public eye will not be on the agent in Africa, the public voice cannot control his movements. His instructions may be perfect; but that is no guarantee that they will be faithfully observed. Besides, Lord Stanley agrees that Kroos may resort to the colonies unaccompanied by their wives and families, or by any females whatsoever. The horrible results of such an arrangement may be imagined, but decency forbids their mention. Is the noble Lord prepared, as a Christian man, to bear the responsibility on his conscience; or, having admitted the arrangement to hold good as respects the introduction of Coolies into Mauritius, does he feel himself bound, in consistency, to admit it in reference to the importation of Kroos into the West Indies? We shudder at the contemplation of these things."

Our British Anti-Slavery friends have abundant reason to be alarmed. Lord Stanley's plan appears very plausible, but scarcely more so than did the project of Sir John Hawkins, the first Englishman who engaged in the slave trade. A statement of this project, and how it worked, as given in an old Historical Account of South Carolina and Georgia, printed in London 1779, will show how little the origin of the slave-trade as carried on by the English, differs from the Emigration plan of Lord Stanley.

In 1562, Sir John Hawkins, having secured the patronage of Sir Lionel Duckett, Sir Thomas Lodge and Sir William Winter, to his plan for transporting African laborers to the western world, where the European was unable to work, set sail for Africa, and in a few weeks arrived at Sierra Leone, where he began to trade with the natives. He commenced by giving them a glowing description of the country whither he was bound, contrasted it with the barrenness of their country, pointed to their nakedness and destitution, and promised them plenty to eat and drink, and large recompense, and a happy life, if they would go along with him. He plied them with trinkets and food and clothes, and assured them that in the strange country, the people were as kind and generous as himself. The negroes were deceived, and "three hundred stout fellows" consented to embark with him. An assault being made upon them the night before his departure, he rushed upon the assailants, took several of them prisoners of war, and carried them too on board his vessels. He then set sail for Hispaniola, but kept up throughout the voyage, a marked distinction between the emigrants, & the prisoners of war, and when he sold them all to the Spanish planters, he was at great pains to insist upon this distinction. But the Spaniards bought them all at the same rate, and it mattered nothing to them, which gang came voluntarily, which against their wills—they were henceforth all alike slaves.

Such was the mild beginning of the Anglo-African slave-trade, which has filled the world with unutterable horrors;—and we confess that in our estimation, Lord Stanley's Emigration plan snacks too much of Sir John Hawkins' Transportation scheme.

## Freedom in the West Indies.

Some time since, a correspondent admonished us to be careful in publishing accounts about the West Indies, lest we should mislead people. It seems that we had inserted an article from a Jamaica paper, giving a flattering statement of the crops &c., which some wise friend of our correspondent said was attributable to the peculiarly favorable state of the season, compared with the previous one. For the benefit of this gentleman we cut the following extracts at random from the London Anti-Slavery Reporter, which copies them from West India papers.

GREENADA.—The Grenada papers to the 29th of

October are without news of any importance. The October session of the Supreme Court was held on the 25th.—"The Grand Jury," says the Chronicle, "having been addressed by the Chief Justice on the peaceful state of the country, and the diminution of crime, retired to their room, and in the course of the day brought in two bills,"—one, arson, and the other stabbing. The prisoner in the former case was, "after a patient investigation," acquitted, and the other traversed to the December term. These constituted the entire criminal proceedings of the Court.

Tobago.—From the address of the Chief Justice of Tobago to the Grand Jury, we make the following extract to show the general freedom from crime of the emancipated population. His Honor said:—"It is with extreme satisfaction I inform you that the cases to be submitted to your consideration are few, and not of an aggravated character—one excepted. It is gratifying," he added, "to observe the steady progress of the laboring classes in the paths of civilization."—6th of October.

St. Lucia CROPS.—"Returns of Colonial Produce, &c., which export duty has been paid into the treasury during five years from 1838 to 1842, both inclusive:—

	SUGAR, lbs.	COFFEE, lbs.
1838	5,533,320	135,008
1839	5,151,108	145,832
1840	5,683,820	303,820
1841	4,677,350	67,251
1842	6,405,365	144,441

  

	COCOA, lbs.	RUM, galls.
1838	38,590	6930
1839	54,639	11,350
1840	82,293	9,900
1841	78,225	10,900
1842	47,025	9,900

  

	MOLASSES, galls.	LOGWOOD, tons.
1838	110,000	108
1839	119,000	218
1840	73,200	206
1841	103,000	132
1842	127,600	114

"This official Return of produce shipped this year, notwithstanding the severe drought, contains the most satisfactory proof of the success which has attended the working of the estates during the past season, and we trust it will satisfy our planters that they need only turn to proper account the labor which they have at command, to accomplish the result which we have steadily maintained to be practicable; namely, to produce by the free labor of our existing peasantry, crops of sugar equal to those raised by the compulsory labor of the whole population while in the state of slavery."—November 24.

DOMINICA.—From the latest agricultural report on the state of the colony, we learn that "the cane fields are looking well, and their appearance pleasing to sight," but that there appears to be "a backwardness in the opening of the land for the crop of 1843." The report complains that the improvements introduced into other islands have not yet reached Dominica, and urges upon the planters the duty of using the "improved plough," and of "easing 'the negroes as much as possible of the heaviest work on the estate;" not because it advocates their interests; but because it "desires to see the planters prospering."—Dominica.

BRITISH GUIANA.—It is well for sugar planters to denounce all men as idle, who do not work in the cane field; and to consider all labor not devoted to the production of sugar, as no better than sheer idleness. But it is only fair in forming an estimate of the true amount of the industry of the Berbice laborers during the last four years, to take into account what they have done for themselves, as well as what they have done for their employers. Now, besides the produce made in Berbice since the emancipation, and the plantation cottages and other buildings erected, the laborers of Berbice, as appears from a return now before us, have, within that period, built for themselves no less than eleven hundred and eighty-four freehold cottages. To these cottages are attached about seven thousand acres of land, purchased at a cost of upwards of a hundred thousand dollars, and put into cultivation in provisions. These freeholds are occupied by twelve thousand and thirty-three families, including four thousand six hundred and forty-six individuals. More than a fourth part of the lazy Berbice agricultural laborers have already houses of their own, purchased and built by their own labor! Nor has the acquisition of their own houses withdrawn them from the cultivation. While their houses were building they could not give the same labor as before to their old employers; but after they were built, as appears by the same return, the able-bodied laborers mostly applied themselves to plantation labor, leaving the grounds to be looked after by the children and the invalids.—Gazette, Dec. 8th.

GUAYANA.—Return of produce manufactured in and exported from the island of Grenada during the years 1840, 1841, and 1842.—SUGAR.—1840, 5,473 hhds., 708 tierces, 931 barrels; 1841, 4,972 hhds., 806 tierces, 1,511 barrels; 1842, 5,096 hhds., 347 tierces, 1,940 barrels. MOLASSES.—1840, 442 puncheons, 350 casks; 1841, 490 puncheons, 14 casks; 1842, 435 puncheons, 126 casks. RUM.—1840, 2,245 puncheons; 1841, 46 hhds., 1,367 puncheons; 1842, 56 hhds., 1,198 puncheons. COCOA.—1840, 120 barrels, 1,836 bales; 1841, 264 barrels, 2,044 bales; 1842, 400 barrels, 2,161 bales. COTTON.—1840, 383 bales; 1841, 219 bales; 1842, 370 bales.—St. George's Chronicle, Dec. 17, 1842.

The man who at this time of day, undertakes to tell us that the "Experiment of Freedom has proved a failure in the West Indies," is as impudent as he is dishonest.

## French Colonies.

By the Report of the Minister of Marine, the whole population of the French Colonies in America, Senega, the Isle of Bourbon, and in the East Indies, amounted, December 31st, 1839, to 555,525,—277,794 males, 277,731 females.

In Martinique, the free population numbers, 40,733, and the slaves, 74,323. In Gaudaloupe, and the neighboring islands, free people, 36,360; slaves, 93,646. At Bourbon, free people, 37,726; slaves, 66,013.

French Guiana, free people, 5,654; slaves, 15,519.

Marriages (so called) among slaves in the French colonies are very rare. During six years, from 1834 to 1839, on an average, there were at Martinique, 17, at Gaudaloupe, 12, and at Bourbon, 0.

As an illustration of the destructiveness of slavery, we may note, that the slave population of Bourbon, Martinique, Gaudaloupe and Guiana, fell off from the end of the year 1833 to 1840, from 261,500 to 249,500. The numbers of deaths in this period exceeded that of births, by 6,940. It may have been noticed that in the foregoing account from the British West Indies, the manufacture of Rum had decreased. In these slave colonies of France, it has increased. We have no objection that Rum, Slavery and Tobacco should go together—they are fit associates. The production of sugar in these colonies in 1841, had fallen below that of 1834, 7 million kilogrammes, but the manufacture of Rum which in 1834 amounted to 3,502,680 litres, in 1839 had increased to 5,628,000 litres.

The exports of the French colonies in 1839, amounted to 88,415,557 £; the imports the same year, to 72,349,618 £.

## Abolition of Slavery in Tunis.

That the Bey of Tunis should be abolishing slavery, while some of our Theologians are in the process of being canonized by American statesmen for proving the Divinity of the system, excited no small wonder. A peculiarly interesting letter from Tunis, throws some light upon the subject.

Some time in April, 1841, the British consul at Tunis, took it upon himself, without direction from his government, to lay before the Bey several "striking observations upon slavery," which produced a decided impression. The reply of the Mussulman was, he would give an answer as soon as possible. Sir Thomas Reade, the consul, had not been gone an hour, when a letter was put into his hands, announcing that the Bey "had actually prohibited any exportation or importation of slaves by sea." The act created great sensation, but the Bey stood firm.

The next step was, to prohibit the sale of slaves in the market—he even had the public slave-market, which for centuries had been the resort of the trafficker in human blood, pulled down. Several months were then allowed to go by, so that public excitement might die away, and then another blow was struck:—"The introduction of men of color from the interior, under any pretext, was declared illegal, and any negro thus imported, after the date of the proclamation was to be considered absolutely free!"

In all these movements, he had to contend against the prejudices, the long established customs, the very religion of the Moors; but he persisted and at last crowned his acts by a "proclamation to the authorities under him, ordering, that all negroes who shall be born after the 8th December, 1842, shall be free, and considered and treated as any other Mussulmans."

In Tunis, this is virtually putting an end to the whole slave system.

"It is an invariable custom," the writer of the letter referred to, says, "to liberate slaves either on the birth and marriage, or on the death of some member of their families; and there have been frequent examples of rich Moors liberating from 20 to 30 slaves at a time, on such occasions. At the beginning of the affair, his Highness the Bey, declared all the negroes who might be in his service, entirely free, and his ministers have respectively followed his example."

In our country, whose government is founded on the assumption of the natural freedom and equality of rights of the human race, and whose religion condemns slavery, root and branch, the President of the United States holds on to the numerous slaves, notwithstanding he knows these facts, and has been repeatedly requested by public meetings to let them go free!

He is a hundred degrees below the Mussulman, after all. The Bey is better than his religion, our President is worse than his.

The thought of the inconsistency of this nation seems to arise spontaneously in the mind of the letter-writer—for he remarks—

"It would be great injustice, if we were to lose this opportunity of executing the system of slavery in the United States of America. This is a Christian country—the people who inhabit it profess to worship that God who requires of us 'to do unto others as we would they should do unto us.' These people profess to be 'a model republic,' to be free and enlightened citizens, but where greater atrocities are perpetrated against the most manifest laws of justice and humanity than in any other country in the world."

We conclude by reminding our readers of the obligations which we owe His Highness the Bey of Tunis for being the first Prince of Africa who has declared slavery to be a crime, and in an age when Christians continue to hold man as property to be bought and sold, liberated slaves as an immediate consequence of that noble, that just, that humane declaration—and by exhorting them to support His Highness to the utmost of their power in consolidating his authority over the improving destinies of Northern Africa.

## Governor Shannon.

And the man that stole his own wife and children.

Weak again, is it true that the Democratic Governor of this state has issued his warrant for the arrest and delivery of a man, who had taken his wife and children from Slavery to Freedom? IS IT TRUE? The Rev. Jno. Rankin of Ripley is our authority. He says, he believes it is true. If so, the name of Shannon should be rung from one end of the continent to the other, as a word of infamy. What! arrest a man, and deliver him up to the bloody slave-hunter, to be consigned to the penitentiary for ten years, for loving and protecting his wife and children, for doing for them that which God had made it his duty to do, and for neglecting which he might justly be damned! Has it come to this? Have we a Governor base enough to assume that it is a crime for a husband and father, peacefully to take his wife and children from a bondage which exposes the former every moment to a ravishing lust, and the latter to the clutches of the soulless soul-driver, and to place them, where alone they may fulfil to him the duties, which the word of God has enjoined upon them under the most solemn sanctions! If we have, let the world know it, and if but three-fifths of the people of Ohio have the hearts of men, Governor Shannon will ere long be thrust down to the extreme depths of political degradation. Aye, and if this thing be true, were there virtue enough in the men of the Buckeye State, he would be impeached for gross inhumanity. Why, were the lightning of heaven to blast the man, who should put forth his impious hand to arrest a father and a husband, for saving his wife and offspring from the blood and lust and chains of slavery, the very stones would cry out that his doom was just.

Again we ask, and again we intend to ask, is it true, that Governor Shannon has done this infamous deed?

## Pleasures of an Editor.

Last week, we had to pay 15¢ postage on a letter from a gentleman, containing a request to send him the Philanthropist for one year, with the distinct understanding, that he would pay, if he could, which he himself thought rather doubtful! That was cool.

By the same mail we had orders, to discontinue two papers to two gentlemen in Hibbardville, who owed us, each, from six to eight dollars! That was honest.

About the same time we were informed, that some pleasant fellows had taken it into their heads, that we were making money, because we

received so many subscribers for "Facts for the People"—whereat, lest we should be too much puffed up, they concluded, we suppose, that they would not pay their dues on the Philanthropist. That was considerate.

To these friends, we have four things to say—1st. We want no one to subscribe for the month, for our sake—if he choose to take it for his own sake, and the benefit of his neighbors, he is welcome to do so.

2nd. If they are greatly troubled, lest it should turn out a money-making concern, let them ask the publisher of their county paper, how much he could make on it, at 12½ cents a year.

3d. If an anti-slavery editor, after assuming the whole pecuniary burthen of a newspaper establishment, which has annually brought a committee into debt to the amount of \$1,500, or \$2,000, can so manage as to make it sustain itself and him too, relieving the Anti-Slavery Society of all obligation, and asking no favors from any body—thus making it what no other strictly anti-slavery paper in the country is—a self-sustaining concern; we should think that the true friends of humanity would rejoice were he able to lay by enough of his earnings, to buy himself a library or some such luxury.

4th. So far, however, from the Philanthropist concern having enabled its editor and proprietor to do even this, the whole of the proceeds of both Philanthropist and "Facts for the People," have been and are now required to keep them going, and furnish us with the simple necessities of life.

Again we say to all our subscribers, we ask no favors. Just pay us our subscription price promptly, and we will give you the paper punctually—and then we think, you will have the best of the bargain—don't you?

## Editorial Proprieties.

We greatly dislike controversy; but our position as an anti-slavery editor occasionally subjects us to the necessity of animadverting upon the policy which some of our contemporaries choose to pursue in relation to the slavery question. In such cases, we make it a point to go no further in our strictures, than our judgment of duty to the slave requires. If we are severe, it is not because we delight in severity. If we apply any epithet, it is for the sake of designating the true position of an opponent, not because of any personal hostility. These rules we endeavored to observe in our remarks two weeks since, on the Western Christian Advocate. We spoke of the editor, as we believed truth required—and our remarks were elicited by a covert attack made by him, upon anti-slavery men and measures. The reply to these remarks in the last number of the Christian Advocate is as follows—

"The Philanthropist, of last week, made several false statements concerning the editor of the Western Christian Advocate; and I have good reason to believe that Dr. Bailey knows that they are false."

Now if my clerical friend were a just man, he would

1st. Specify what he pronounces "several false statements;" and

2ly. State his reasons for believing that Dr. Bailey knew that they were false.

At least such justice, my religion would teach me, were I to bring an accusation of FALSEHOOD against the editor of the Western Christian Advocate. Perhaps, being an aged man, a Minister of the gospel, and a Doctor of Divinity, he does not feel bound to observe the rules of gentlemanly decorum, and Christian justice, towards an untitled layman, so many years his junior; if so, we can only regret that he has fallen so far below the estimate that we had placed upon his character.

## Romanism and Protestantism.

A few days since, we listened with some surprise to a sermon from a Protestant minister, against Protestantism! He propounded three questions—1st. Is Protestantism preferable to true Catholicism? 2nd. Is Protestantism preferable to Romanism? 3rd. Ought Romanism to be opposed? The first two questions he answered decidedly in the negative—the third, in the affirmative.

Our object is, not to animadvert on this singular sermon, but to point out a capital error into which the sermonizer fell—an error so common among writers and speakers upon similar subjects, as not to be noticed. It is this, he confounded Protestantism with the Protestant churches. Generally these churches to a certain extent are built upon Protestant principles—but to a very limited extent. In fact, Protestantism holds about the same relation to all the large ecclesiastical Protestant organizations, which the American Declaration of Independence does, to these republics. Its principles are loudly professed, exemplified too on a limited scale, but in numerous particulars falsified. So of Protestantism. What is it? What are its distinguishing principles? They are these—the right of private judgment, the freedom of conscience, individual independence of human authority in religious matters, the Bible the sole rule of Faith, and every man his own interpreter, and the diffusion of ecclesiastical power among the laity.

This is Protestantism, and these principles are vital to human freedom, and human progress. They are such as every true friend of his race is prepared to pour out his heart's best blood to maintain. Now, if we understand the matter rightly, Romanism repudiates every one of these principles—and yet a Protestant minister gravely announces to his congregation that he prefers it to Protestantism! We have nothing to do, as an anti-slavery editor, with the religious dogmas or usages of the Roman Catholic church—but, we avow deadly and perpetual warfare against every organization, political or ecclesiastical, every system, spiritual or civil, which would lay sacrilegious hands upon a single right of human nature—its right of private judgment, its freedom of conscience, liberty of press, liberty of speech, or any other right, which is necessary to make man truly independent, and responsible ultimately to but one Being in the universe—the God who made him.

## Under Subjection.

Not long since, the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Cleves, earnestly solicited Samuel Lewis to aid them in a protracted meeting in that place. The day before he

was to visit them, he was waited upon by a messenger, instructed to inform him that the mob in Cleves had threatened disturbance, and his Methodist brethren would rather he would absent himself. They professed to be actuated by fears for his safety. Perhaps they were—nay, we believe many of them were. But, were there no other motives? Had not the opponents of abolitionism in Cleves promised to aid the Methodists in putting up a church? Did not the good brethren shrink from identifying themselves under such circumstances with a man, who by his boldness, had rendered himself peculiarly unacceptable to the mobocrats? Were they not afraid of being placed in a situation, where they would in a certain emergency, have been obliged to defend an abolitionist? Howsoever they may answer these questions, there was no manliness or Christianity in suffering a miserable mobocrats to dictate to them what ministers they should or should not employ, in their religious meetings.

How many such transactions must take place, before Mr. Lewis be convinced that he has not quite all the liberty he wants in the Methodist Episcopal church!

## "Facts for the People."

We have now two thousand subscribers; but this is nothing like enough. There were 5500 Liberty voters at the last election. Certainly all these ought to be subscribers. A friend who has been active in circulating them, writes—

"FACTS" are loudly called for in these days of falsehood and misrepresentation. They are opening the eyes of some of the brethren in this vicinity. We have long needed such a cheap publication in this state, in order that it may come within the means of every reader. It has the advantage of a large paper in this way: persons who are not in the habit of reading much, can sit down and go through with it in a short time, whereas if it were a large paper, such persons would scarcely touch it."

## Intolerant.

The managers of the Engine House No. 5, have been in the habit of leaving out their hall for all sorts of purposes. For a time it was occupied by the Universalists, for religious meetings; and, if we mistake not, the Mormons have had the benefit of it. Late the "Methodist church," just organized in this city, requested the use of it on Sabbath, and one night in every week, offering at the same time a fair compensation. Their request was refused! Some of the managers were members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and it was well understood, that the new church was anti-slavery in its principles!

Shame upon such intolerance!

## Worthy of Remark.

We learn that within about three weeks, three gentlemen, old residents of Cincinnati, members of the Methodist Episcopal Church for many years past, in good standing, one of them a class leader, and one of them a representative of this county formerly in the Legislature, have liberated several slaves owned by them in Kentucky.

What has the North to do with slavery?

What has the Methodist Episcopal church in the free states to do with slavery?

Why should ministers in Cincinnati preach against slavery?

What is the use of agitating the question here—why not go to the South?

## Information Desired.

Certain friends in Mercer county wish to know of us, whether Free Labor goods are for sale any where in Western Ohio or Indiana, and if so, where, and of what kind.

A brief answer to this request in our columns will be of service.

## A New Catechism.

"The Board of Publication have issued a C



